

### **Remarks**

The Applicants acknowledge the Restriction Requirement dividing the Application into three groups as follows: Group I, including Claims 1 – 7 and 10; Group II, including Claims 8 and 9; and Group III, including Claims 11 – 20. The Applicants note that their original Request for a Divisional Application cancelled Claims 1 – 4 and 6 – 20. A highlighted copy of that Request is enclosed for the Examiner's convenience. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the Restriction Requirement is moot. In any event, for the sake of complete responsiveness, the Applicants elect Group I which, subsequent to the cancellation of certain of the claims therein, leaves Claim 5 for examination.

The Applicants acknowledge the objection to Claims 7 – 20. The Applicants respectfully submit that that objection is now moot in view of the prior cancellation of those claims.

The Applicants acknowledge the rejection of Claims 1 – 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112. The Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is moot with respect to Claims 1 – 4 and 6. With respect to Claim 5, the Applicants have amended that claim to recite that the various volume percentages of the components (a) and (b) are based on the sum of the components (a) and (b). Withdrawal of the §112 rejection of Claim 5 is respectfully requested.

The Applicants acknowledge the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection of Claims 1 – 3 based on EP '616 and Claims 4 and 6 based on US '422. The Applicants respectfully submit that both of those rejections are moot in view of the cancellation of those claims.

The Applicants acknowledge the double-patenting rejection of Claims 1 – 3 and 6 over co-pending Application 10/089,842 on the one hand and co-pending Application 10/746,822 on the


other hand. The Applicants respectfully submit that both of those double-patenting rejections are moot in view of the cancellation of those claims.

The Applicants acknowledge the double-patenting rejection of Claims 1 – 6 based on Claims 1 – 10 of US Patent No. 6,730,378. The Applicants respectfully submit that that rejection is moot as it applies to Claims 1 – 4 and 6.

With respect to Claim 5, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 5 is patentably distinct over all of Claims 1 – 10 of US '378. The Applicants note that Claim 5 specifies that the polyphenylene sulfide resin (b) forms a laminar disperse phase. Reference to each of Claims 1 – 10 of US '378 reveals that there is no mention of such a laminar disperse phase of polyphenylene sulfide resin (b). Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 5 is, in fact, patentably distinct from Claims 1 – 10 over US '378. Withdrawal of the double-patenting rejection of Claim 5 is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that the entire Application is now in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



T. Daniel Christenbury  
Reg. No. 31,750  
Attorney for Applicants

TDC:lh:vbm  
(215) 656-3381